UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,036	07/12/2001	Jonathan J. Hull	015358-006000US	2402

20350 7590 03/11/2004		EXAMINER
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP		CHEN, CHONGSHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	13

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/905,036	HULL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chongshan Chen	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-44* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5,10,11,12</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-44 are pending in this Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The references cited in the IDS, PTO-1449, Paper No. 5 and 10-12, have been

considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper et al.

("Cooper", 6,101,503).

As per claim 1, Cooper teaches a method of providing information to a user based upon

contents of a first document displayed to the user, the method comprising:

identifying the first document displayed to the user (Cooper, col. 4, lines 13-20);

identifying at least a first section of the first document (Cooper, col. 3, lines 12-26, col. 4,

lines 13-28);

extracting a first set of information objects from the first section of the first document

(Cooper, Fig. 2 & 4, col. 3, lines 17-18).

Cooper further teaches using the first set of information objects from the first document to retrieve documents which are related to the first document (Cooper, Fig. 4, element 430, 450). Cooper does not explicitly disclose determining a degree of relevancy between the first document and its related document. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank function to determine a degree of relevance between the first document and its related documents in order to rank the documents according to their relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing time.

As per claim 2, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches the first section of the first document corresponds to a section of the first document displayed to the user (Cooper, col. 3, line 12 – col. 4. line 60).

As per claim 3, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches the first section of the first document corresponds to the entire first document (Cooper, col. 3, line 12 – col. 4. line 60).

As per claim 4, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches extracting the first set of information objects from the first section of the first document comprises: for each information object in the first set of information objects: identifying a type of the information object based upon contents of the information object; determining a first content recognition technique based upon the type of the information object (Cooper, col. 4, lines 30-40); and applying the first content recognition technique to the

information object to determine information related to the contents of the information object

(Cooper, col. 3, lines 12-26).

As per claim 5, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1,

and further teaches determining the degree of relevancy information for the second set of

information objects comprises:

identifying a plurality of selection techniques for determining the degree of relevancy

information (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-18); and

for each selection technique in the plurality of selection techniques, applying the

selection technique to generate relevancy scores for information objects in the second set of

information objects, the relevancy scores indicating the relevancy of information objects in the

second set of information objects to information objects in the first set of information objects

calculated using the selection technique (Cooper, Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 13-40); and

selecting the third set of information objects comprises:

selecting information objects from the second set of information objects to be included in

the third set of information objects based upon the relevancy scores for information objects in the

second set of information objects calculated using the plurality of selection techniques (Cooper,

Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 13-40).

As per claim 6, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1,

except for explicitly disclosing calculating an aggregate relevancy score for the information

object by aggregating the relevancy scores generated for the information object by applying the

plurality of selection techniques; and selecting the information object to be included in the third

set of information objects if the aggregated relevancy score calculated for the information object

is above a threshold value. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank function to calculate a relevancy score in order to rank the documents according to their relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing time.

As per claim 7, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches identifying a first selection technique and a second selection technique for determining the degree of relevancy information (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 13-40). Cooper does not explicitly disclose generating relevancy scores. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank function to calculate a relevancy score in order to rank the documents according to their relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing time.

As per claim 8, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches determining a plurality of concepts of interest to the user (Cooper, col. 3, lines 12-26);

determining relevancy of each information object in the first set of information objects to each concept in the plurality of concepts (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 13-20);

determining relevancy of each information object in the second set of information objects to each concept in the plurality of concepts (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 13-20).

Cooper does not explicitly disclose calculating relevancy scores. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank

function to calculate a relevancy score in order to rank the documents according to their

relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing

time.

As per claim 9, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1,

and further teaches identifying a type of the information object based upon contents of the

information object (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 21-40); determining a comparison technique

based upon the type of the information object (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 3, lines 12-26).

Cooper does not explicitly disclose generating relevancy scores. However, the search

system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank

function to calculate a relevancy score in order to rank the documents according to their

relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing

time.

As per claim 10, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1,

and further teaches communicating the third set of information objects to a user system which is

used to output information stored by information objects in the third set of information objects to

the user (Cooper, Fig. 1-4).

As per claim 11, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1,

and further teaches the first document is displayed to the user using an access program and the

information stored by information objects in the third set of information objects is output to the

user in a predetermined area of the access program (Cooper, Fig. 1-4).

As per claim 12, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches the access program is a web browser and the first document is a web page (Cooper, col. 3, lines 50-62).

Claim 13 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1.

As per claim 14, Cooper teaches a method of providing information to a user based upon contents of a document displayed to the user, the method comprising:

accessing a first set of content provider information objects (CPIOs) (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 3, line 12 – col. 4, line 40);

identifying the document displayed to the user (Cooper, col. 4, lines 13-20);

extracting a first set of user document information objects (UDIOs) from the document (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 21-40).

Cooper further teaches using the extracted information objects to retrieve related documents (Cooper, Fig. 4, element 430, 450). Cooper does not explicitly disclose generating degree of relevancy information. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank function to generate a degree of relevance in order to rank the documents according to their relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing time.

Claims 15-27 and 29-41 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-13.

Claims 28 and 42 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 14.

As per claim 43, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 42, and further teaches at least one CPIO included in the first set of CPIOs is provided by a content provider system coupled to the server system (Cooper, Fig. 1).

As per claim 44, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 42, and further teaches the first set of CPIOs comprises a first CPIO and a second CPIO, wherein the first CPIO is provided by a first content provider system coupled to the server system and the second CPIO is provided by a second content provider system coupled to the server system (Cooper, Fig. 1).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is 703-305-8319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703)305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 5, 2004

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER